scoping meetings to help establish the purpose, scope, framework, and approach for the analysis. At each meeting, a presentation will be made which will provide a description of the proposed scope of study using maps and visual aids, as well as a plan for an active citizen involvement program, a budgeted work schedule, and an estimated budget. The public is invited to comment on: The alternatives to be assessed; the modes and technologies to be evaluated; the alignments and termination points to be considered; the environmental, social, and economic impacts to be analyzed; and the evaluation approach to be used to select a locally preferred alternative.

II. Corridor Description

Linking the North Side, Downtown, Hill/Midtown, and Oakland communities, the Spine Line Corridor is one of the most heavily traveled corridors in the Pittsburgh Metropolitan area. The corridor generally encompasses the area of the lower North Side across the Allegheny River to the Central Business District of Downtown Pittsburgh, and through the Hill, Midtown, and Pittsburgh Technology Center areas to Oakland.

III. Alternatives

It is expected that the scoping meetings and written comments will be a major source of candidate alternatives for evaluation in the study. In addition to any new alternatives proposed for evaluation at the scoping meetings, other alternatives proposed for consideration will include those evaluated in the previous analysis which was completed in November 1993 as the Spine Line Corridor Study. One major difference is that the eastern end of the corridor under the previous effort was Squirrel Hill, whereas Oakland is the eastern end for this MIS/DEIS. The following describes the No-Build, Transportation Systems Management (TSM) and Light Rail Transit (LRT) Build Alternatives that were evaluated in the previous study and are being suggested for further study in the Spine Line MIS/DEIS:

1. No-Build Alternative—Existing transit service and programmed new transportation facilities with level of transit service expanded as appropriate to meet projected year 2015 travel demand.

2. TSM Alternative—Low-cost transportation improvements that could include actions such as one-way streets, exclusive bus lanes, intersection channelization, and enhanced levels of bus service.

3. LRT North Side to Downtown Alternative—The northern extension of the LRT system would begin at the intersection of Federal Street and North Avenue, cross the Allegheny River on either a new bridge or the existing Sixth Street Bridge, and then connect with the existing subway at Gateway Station.

4. LRT Downtown to Oakland via Centre Avenue Alternative—Beginning at a junction with the existing LRT line under the Manor Building, the line would head east in a tunnel under Centre Avenue, then proceed east through Oakland under Fifth or Forbes Avenue under Morewood Avenue.

5. LRT Downtown to Oakland via Colwell Street Alternative—Beginning at a junction with the existing LRT line under the Manor Building, the line would run along Colwell Street parallel to Fifth Avenue through the Hill and Midtown communities and then pass through Oakland under Forbes or Fifth Avenue to Morewood Avenue.

6. LRT Downtown to Oakland via the Technology Center Alternative—Beginning at a junction with the existing LRT line at First Avenue, this eastern extension would use the former B&O Railroad right-of-way and run east at-grade from the CBD to the Birmingham Bridge, where it would pass over the Parkway East before entering a tunnel in Oakland where it would be built under Fifth or Forbes Avenue to Morewood Avenue.

In addition to the alternatives described above, new elements proposed for study include an Intra-North Shore Circulator and West Garage. To facilitate east-west movement within the North Shore area, a local circulator system is envisioned to have its west terminus at a new parking garage (or the West Garage) situated across North Shore Drive from the Carnegie Science Center, and extend east to Sandusky Street while connecting several major destinations in the Lower North Shore Area. The circulator could take the form of enclosed walkways, enclosed moving walkways, dedicated bus lanes, shuttle buses, or people movers such as the one used at Pittsburgh International Airport.

The above represents the set of alternatives initially being considered for study. Additionally, the MIS/DEIS will consider, based on input received at the four public scoping meetings, variations of the above alternatives and other transportation investments, both transit and non-transit, for the Spine Line Corridor. The four public scoping meetings are the critical first step to chart the course of the MIS/DEIS and will be designed to actively encourage open discussion and identification of all possible study alternatives.

IV. Probable Effects

Impacts proposed for analysis are potential changes on: The physical environment (air quality, noise, water quality, aesthetics, etc.); the social environment (land use, development patterns, neighborhoods, etc.); parklands and historic resources; transportation system performance; capital, operating, and maintenance costs; and financial resources for transportation projects in the Southwestern Pennsylvania region. Impacts will be identified for both the construction period and for the long term operation of the alternatives recommended for detailed study.

Evaluation criteria will include transportation, social, economic, and financial measures to be developed by PAT and SPRPC including consideration of measures recommended at the scoping meetings. Mitigating measures will be explored for any adverse impacts that are identified.

Comments on the environmental, social, and economic impacts should focus on the completeness of the proposed sets of alternatives and the evaluation approach. Other impacts or criteria judged relevant to local decision-making will be identified.

Issued on: January 18, 1995.

Sheldon A. Kinbar,

Regional Administrator.

[FR Doc. 95–1609 Filed 1–20–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–57–P

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

[Docket No. 95–003; Notice 1]

Solicitation of Comments for the Content of a Strategic Plan for Research for Heavy Truck Safety

AGENCY: National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), DOT.

ACTION: Request for comment.

SUMMARY: Report 103–310 of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which accompanied H.R. 4556, Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill 1995, directs the NHTSA to develop a 5-year strategic plan outlining the future of its Heavy Truck Safety Research Program. The report is to be delivered to the House and Senate Appropriations Committee before the agency's FY 1996 Appropriations Committee hearings. The Committee directed that the report outline the scope, nature, and direction

of a revitalized Heavy Truck Safety Research Program, which is to be developed in consultation with the American Trucking Association, the FHWA Office of Motor Carriers and the Motor Vehicle Safety Research Advisory Committee. In the recent past, the NHTSA Heavy Vehicle Research Program has followed a research plan which was developed in response to the requirements of Sections 216 and 217 of the Motor Carrier Safety Act of 1984. Significant portions of that work have not been completed. This new plan will define the research work the Agency will undertake on the subject of heavy vehicle safety, in the near and longer term. Interested parties are invited to propose either broad areas of research, or specific topics which warrant study and which would ultimately enhance heavy vehicle safety.

ADDRESSES: Timely completion of this strategic plan dictates that all comments be submitted no later than March 3, 1995 in order to be considered as part of the preparation of the plan. The docket on this plan will remain open until May 1, 1995, however, comments received after March 1, 1995 may not be reflected in the final version of the plan. All comments to this Notice should refer to the docket and notice number indicated above, and be submitted to the following: Docket Section, Room 5109, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590. Docket hours are 9:30 a.m., to 4 p.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Robert M. Clarke, Heavy Vehicle Research Division, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 400 Seventh Street, SW., Washington, DC 20590 (202) 366–5662.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In response to its statutory responsibility to improve motor vehicle safety, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration has historically conducted a vigorous program of research to identify ways to enhancing the safety design and performance of heavy vehicles. This program parallels and complements the Agency's and the Federal Highway Administration efforts to address the in-use operational safety aspects of motor carrier operations and commercial driver competency. In late 1986 and early 1987, the Agency published two report (*Truck Occupant Protection*, DOT HS 807 081, and *Heavy Truck Safety Study*, DOT HS 807 109, which are available for review at the NHTSA Technical Reference Division, Room 5110, weekdays between the hours of 9:30 AM and 4:00 PM) in response to a Congressional directive similar to the one now being addressed. Those reports were developed as part of consensus-building effort with industry and other affected and interested parties to identify priority topics of research. Four such topics were identified: brake system performance, handling/stability/controllability, truck occupant protection, and truck aggressivity in truck/car collisions. Work has since been completed on many of the sub issues that were included under these broad topic headings.

For example, the Agency completed an extensive program of both vehicle performance testing and in-service evaluation of the durability/reliability/maintainability of antilock braking systems for heavy vehicles, which culminated in the development of proposed revisions to the braking performance requirements for heavy vehicles contained in Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards (FMVSS) 121 and 135. Likewise, the Agency is working cooperatively with industry, under the auspices of the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE), to support research whose ultimate goal is the development of a number of consensus Recommended Test Procedures to assess the performance of occupant restraints, the occupant impact attenuation properties of cab interior surfaces/steering wheels, and the structural integrity of truck cabs. That work is nearing completion. Also, the agency culminated a substantial portion of the work it had sponsored on handling/stability over a 10 year period, by developing analysis and testing procedures for assessing the rollover propensity of tractors and trailers, as well as the rearward lateral acceleration amplification tendencies of multiple trailer combination-unit trucks making abrupt lane change maneuvers.

While the agency continues to believe it will be necessary to focus some of its heavy vehicle research resources on braking, handling/stability, and truck occupant protection, it believes there are additional new opportunities to further reduce the number of heavy vehicle crashes, and their consequences, through the application and use of advanced electronics and communications technologies in collision avoidance warning/control system applications, by integrating human factors research findings into heavy vehicle cab system and information display designs, and by continuing to seek practical means of reducing truck aggressivity in car/truck collisions.

Accordingly, the agency seeks comments about the appropriateness of content of the broad areas of research outlined above, as well as suggestions for the content of programs addressing these subjects. Additional ideas for specific topics of research or broad subject areas which warrant further attention are also sought.

Issued on: January 17, 1995.

George L. Parker,

Associate Administrator for Research and Development.

[FR Doc. 95–1610 Filed 1–20–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910–59–M

[Docket No. 94–27; Notice 2]

Denial of Petition for Import Eligibility Decision

This notice sets forth the reasons for the denial of a petition submitted to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) under 49 U.S.C. 30141(a)(B) (formerly section 108(c)(3)(C)(i)(II) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act (the Act)). the petition, which was submitted by G&K Automotive Conversion, Inc. of Santa Ana, California (B&K), a registered importer of motor vehicles, requested NHTSA to decide that a 1985 Ferrari 412 passenger car that was not originally manufactured to comply with all applicable Federal motor vehicle safety standards is eligible for importation into the United States because its safety features comply with, or are capable of being altered to comply with, those standards based on destructive test information or other evidence the Secretary of Transportation decided in adequate.

NHTA published a notice in the **Federal Register** on April 25, 1994 (59 FR 19745) that contained a thorough description of the petition, and solicited public comments upon it. No comments were received in response to this notice.

Following publication of the notice, NHTSA requested G&K to submit test data or other information to demonstrate that the 1985 Ferrari 412 is capable of being altered to comply with the crashworthiness requirements of Standard Nos. 208 Occupant Crash Protection and 301 Fuel System Integrity G&K was unable to submit this information to NHTSA. Accordingly, NHTSA has concluded that the petition does not clearly demonstrate that the non-U.S. certified 1985 Farrari 412 is eligible for importation. The petition must therefore be denied under 49 CFR 593.7(e).

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. 30141(b)(1) (formerly section 108(c)(3)(C)(ii) of the Act), NHTSA will not consider a new import eligibility petition covering this vehicle until at